



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,144	12/30/1999	FEN-CHUNG KUNG	1999-0241	6003

26652 7590 07/02/2003

AT&T CORP.
P.O. BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/475,144

Applicant(s)

KUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-36 and 38-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-36 and 38-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 16, 19.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-6, 11-14, 19-25, 30-33, 38-43, and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. (U.S. Patent 4,893,335) in view of Arbel et al. (U.S. Patent 5,276,731).

Referring to claims 1 and 38, Fuller et al. teach the control system 10 is housed in a rectangular box 14 installed with a conventional desk telephone 12 (“customer premise equipment”) utilizes the three-way calling capability of the telephone service central office to perform call forwarding. The ringing of the incoming call is detected by the ring detector 22 and causing the CPU 34 to energize the off hook relay 36 to answer the incoming call and convey the call forwarding information to the central office (“the in-network call management device”) to place the incoming call on temporary hold. The CPU then dials the call forwarding number either through the dial pulse generator, then de-energizes the off hook relay to release the held incoming call thereby connecting the incoming call to the call forwarded station. However, Fuller does not teach call forwarding in an IP telephone network, and checking whether there is an active call forwarding profile for the first telephone.

Arbel teaches creating/setting up call forwarding profile (col. 10, lines 11-27). Furthermore, the steps of: dialing a unique identifier for a first telephone from a second telephone to make a call; checking stored call forwarding profiles to determine whether there is

Art Unit: 2642

an active call forwarding profile for first telephone; connecting said call to first telephone if an active call forwarding profile is not found; routing the call to at least a third telephone if there is an active call forwarding profile for the first telephone are standard call forwarding features. Applicant's claimed invention is merely the use of the conventional, old and well known call forwarding feature in an IP environment. The basic and conventional call forwarding feature may obviously be used in many different environments such as PBX, Centrex, LAN or the Internet. The advantages of the call forwarding feature need not be addressed because they are well known. It is obvious to use this feature in different environment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow subscribers to create/set up call forwarding profile according to their own schedule/preferences in the IP telephone network in order to receive and process IP telephone calls according to their needs. The advantages of using IP telephony are well known. For example, IP telephone calls are economical.

Referring to claims 2, 21, and 39, Fuller et al. teach the control system 10 can be programmed to produce predetermined ring patterns (col. 3, lines 39-59) reads on claimed "using a distinctive ringing tone at the at least third telephone to indicate that the incoming call is a forwarded call".

Referring to claims 3, 22, and 40, Fuller et al. do not mention subscriber creates call forwarding profiles using a computer connected to customer premises equipment via phone lines. Arbel teaches using personal communication software to access to a remote database/profiles (col. 7, lines 4-7).

Referring to claims 4, 23, and 41, Fuller et al. do not teach Broadband Residential Gateway (Fig. 2, 207 and 213), and subscriber creates call forwarding profiles by interacting with the customer premises equipment. Arbel teaches subscriber creates call forwarding profiles by interacting with the customer premises equipment (col. 6, lines 33-40).

Referring to claims 5, 6, 24, 25, 42, and 43, Fuller et al. and Arbel do not teach the active call forwarding profile remains active until the call forwarding profile is disabled or deleted from the customer premises equipment by a subscriber. They are well known file processing features. For example, database will remain on customer premises equipment until file deleted.

Referring to claims 11-14, 30-33, and 48-51, Fuller et al. do not teach the call forwarding profile specifies that call are only to be forwarded during predetermined periods of time are various days of the week or hours or the day or hours and days of the week. Arbel teaches the call forwarding profile specifies that call are only to be forwarded during predetermined periods of time are various days of the week or hours or the day or hours and days of the week (col. 10, lines 11-27).

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Fuller et al. do not teach customer premises device has memory is a flash memory means for call forwarding profiles. Arbel teaches customer premises device has memory is a flash memory means for call forwarding profiles and means for determining if the call forwarding profile is active when a call is received at the customer premises device for the telephone (Fig. 3, 370).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a flash memory exists in any customer premises device and is necessary in order to store call forwarding profiles.

3. Claims 7-10, 17, 26-29, 36, 44-47, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. (U.S. Patent 4,893,335) in view of Arbel et al. (U.S. Patent 5,276,731) and further in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent 5,946,386).

Referring to claims 7-9, 26-28, and 44-46, Fuller et al. and Arbel do not teach call forwarding profile comprises multiple unique identifiers to which the call can be routed or simultaneously or sequentially to the multiple unique identifiers.

Rogers teaches call forwarding profile comprises multiple unique identifiers to which the call can be routed or simultaneously or sequentially to the multiple unique identifiers (col. 37, lines 53-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the features call forwarding profile comprises multiple unique identifiers to which the call can be routed or simultaneously or sequentially to the multiple unique identifiers, as taught by Rogers, in to Fuller's system in order to have a complete and sufficient call forwarding profile.

Referring to claims 10, 29, and 47, Rogers teaches call forwarding profile only forwards calls from a predetermined list of caller unique identifiers (col. 37, lines 31-33).

Referring to claims 17 and 36, Rogers teaches customer premises equipment is a Broadband Residential Gateway ((Fig.2, 207 and 213).

Art Unit: 2642

Claim 52 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Furthermore, Rogers teaches decision was made on routing the calls (Fig. 5 and col. 24, lines 14-57) read on claimed "sending control signal".

4. Claims 15, 16, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. (U.S. Patent 4,893,335) in view of Arbel et al. (U.S. Patent 5,276,731) and further in view of Agraharam et al. (U.S. Patent 5,987,508).

Referring to claims 15, 16, 34, and 35, Fuller et al. and Arbel do not teach that the unique identifier is a telephone number or an IP address. Agraharam teaches the unique identifier is the recipient's telephone number, which associated with an e-mail address/IP address. (Abstract, lines 4-5 and col. 1, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the connectivity between the use of the telephone network and an e-mail address to reduce the complexity of remembering and/or keep track of the e-mail addresses of multiple recipients.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 19-36, and 38-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's arguments are addressed in the above claims rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Clark, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,077,789) teaches remotely commanded telephone switch enhancing system functions in combination with a local telephone set that is connected to

Art Unit: 2642

a single telephone line that is designed to enhance the utility of the telephone call forwarding service.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451.


The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen
June 23, 2003


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600